from month to month? We know exactly what happened in the case of the Shaw Wallace. The same is being repeated with this particular company. We can merely appeal to the Government and to the kind heartedness of the Minister of Industry, for a change let us decide and not talk. It is a simple decision which he can take right at this moment. If he doesn't do it, then, there would be very widespread implications of this.

Now, already our economic situation has given rise to very widespread comments outside the country that we have an unstable economy, that we are not managing our affairs and that we are rogue elephants to roll about freely bringing ruination of the economy. If you keep on repeating what this infamous person ensconced in Dubai did, there will be a further black-spot against our country's name. Kindly consider that aspect of the matter.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Mr. Chairman, Sir my heart goes out to the hon. Member, Shri Ashok Mitra. I fully appreciate his concern. I can assure him that this is a case where the Government is going to be pro-active to deal with the situation.

**प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा:** सभापति महोदय, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि यह जो मामला डनलप का है, शॉ वैलेस का है और बहुत सी कम्पनियों का है, इससे पहले क्या कोई पोलिटिकल और इनकी आपस में मिलीभगत थी जिसकी वजह से यह सब होता रहा? क्या पहले के जो मंत्री थे या पहले के जो राजनीतिज्ञ थे, उनके गठजोड़ से यह सब कुछ हुआ? ...(व्यवधान)...

It is a very, very serious matter.

यह आज इतनी गंभीर बात है, क्योंकि आपको चुभ रही है इसलिए आप कह रहे हैं।

I am not putting a question to you.

क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताएंगे कि 21 मार्च से पहले लगातार इतने सालों तक इन कंपनियों में जो धांधलियां होती रहीं, इनके ऊपर कोई ऐक्शन क्यों नहीं लिया गया? क्या पौलिटिशियंस और इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स, इनकी मिलीभगत से यह सारा काम हुआ?

**श्री सिकन्दर बख्त:** मेरी नजर के सामने इस किस्म की कोई बात नहीं आई।

**Working Women Hostels in Karnataka**

*62. SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Will the Minister of SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of working women hostels established in Karnataka with the assistance of Welfare Ministry;

(b) the names and address of NGO's running the working women hostels in Karnataka and the grant given to each of them annually; and

(c) the number of working women staying in each hostel?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE EMPOWERMENT (SMT. MENAKA GANDHI): (a) 78 Working Women's Hostels have been sanctioned so far in Karnataka under the Scheme of assistance for construction/ Expansion of Hostel Building for Working Women with day Care Centre for Children being operated by the Department of Women & Child Development of the Ministry of Human Resource Development.

(b) A list giving names and addresses of the NGO's which have been sanctioned working women's hostels in Karnataka is laid on the Table of the House as *See* Appendix 184 Annexure No. 16. Only non-recurring grant is payable under the above Scheme towards cost of building construction and land. The Scheme does not involve payment of recurring or annual grants.

However, the Central Social Welfare Board, New Delhi gives grants for maintenance of working women's hostels.

A Statement showing grants sanctioned by the Board during 1997-98 is also laid on the Table of the House; as Annexure II *See* Appendix 184 Annexure No. 17.

(c) The capacity of the Hostels sanctioned under the Department's Scheme is mentioned in the list referred to in reply to part (b). The information on actual occupancy in each hostel is being collected from the State Government.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Sir, the Government has assisted 78 working women's hostels in Karnataka. The Government is giving only non-recurring grants for construction of the

building or for acquisition of the land. Because the Government is not giving recurring grants for the working of the hostels, I would like to know out of these 78 hostels, how many hostels are actually functioning. I understand all the hostels are not functioning. So, I would like to know whether the Government have received any complaints about the fact that though non-recurring grants have been taken by them, still, the hostels are not functioning.

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: The information about whether they are functioning or not is to be collected by the State Governments and forwarded to us. We have not received any such complaint so far.

We have a total of 811 hostels for which we have given money. They have provided accommodation to 56,000 working women.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Sir, such large amount of funds are given by the Central Government. I would like to know whether the Ministry of Welfare has any mechanism to ascertain whether these hostels are functioning. There is one hostel in Bangalore, for the construction of which a huge amount of grant was given, but for the last ten years it has not been functioning. The building is there, but the hostel is not functioning. I would like to know whether any such case has been brought to the notice of the Government.

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: Since most of the requests from NGO's corporations, universities, social welfare bodies, colleges and social workers come through the State Government, it is left to the State Governments to monitor them. However, I agree with the hon. Member that monitoring has been very lax in a large number of cases. Therefore, in most schemes of the Welfare Ministry in the last three months, we have changed or are in the process of changing rules to make sure that we have our own system of monitoring. This will ensure that the schemes for which we give money, actually work.

**श्री ओमप्रकाश कोहली:** सभापति महोदय, देश में कामकाजी महिलाओं की संख्या में तेजी से वृद्धि होती जा रही है और इसके साथ-साथ कामकाजी महिलाओं के हॉस्टल की आवश्यकता में भी वृद्धि होती जा रही है। मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदया से जानना चाहूंगा कि देश में कामकाजी महिलाओं के हॉस्टल की आवश्यकता के बारे में किसी प्रकार का सर्वेक्षण किया गाया है जिससे ठीक अंदाजा लग सके कि डिमांड प्रेशर क्या है और उस मांग की पूर्ति के लिए केन्द्र सरकार की ओर से किस प्रकार की योजना है जिससे इस बढ़ती हुई मांग को पूरा करने में केन्द्र सरकार राज्य सरकारों को उचित सहयोग दे सके और कामकाजी महिलाओं के लिए पर्याप्त संख्या में हॉस्टलों का निर्माण हो सके।

SHRI MANEKA GANDHI: Sir, 178 additional hostels were sanctioned during the Eighth Five Year Plan, increasing the capacity by 15,513. An amount of Rs. 7.75 crores has been allocated for the year 1998-99. This does seem to me to be not adequate. But this is the amount that has been sanctioned. Now so far, there has actually been no survey carried out after 1991, to find out as to how many working women are there. In 1991, there were 38.83 lakh working women, and out of these, 1.35 lakh women needed hostel facilities for which the Government has provided Rs. 0.57 lakh. I agree that we need a large number of hostels and it will be the endeavour of this Ministry to see where we can squeeze funds to provide more hostels.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA: Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what the exact number of beneficiaries belonging to the minority community is, as per the chart given here. What is the number of projected and estimated beneficiaries of the hostels which are not yet completed?

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir my understanding of the working women's hostels scheme is that these hostels are for women who are in service, and who have to go away from their homes and work at some other place where they do not have their relatives, and where there are no facilities for their stay. That is my understanding of the working women's hostels. But looking at the list of hostels sanctioned, educational institutions have been given grants for constructing hostels and girl-students are residing in most of these hostels. I think, both the schemes are totally different. If it is a working women's hostel, girl-students need not be there. If you go through the list, you will find that in most of the hostels girl-students are residing and still they are called working women's hostels.

Will the hon. Minister kindly look into the matter and find out as to why working women's hostels are being used for girl-students? There is a separate scheme for girl-students and working women's hostels can be better used for working women.

SHRI MANEKA GANDHI: Sir, the hon. Member is quite right in saying that the schemes are completely different. We give separate money for girls' hostels for residential schools. But we do not actually run these hostels or give money for the recurring expenditure of these hostels. What we do is what we give a one-time grant, which is 50 per cent of the land and 75 per cent of the building. After that, it depends on the State and the Central Social Welfare Board, which does not come under this Ministry, to check who is actually occupying these hostels.

श्रीमती वीणा वर्मा: सभापति महोदय, कामकाजी महिलाओं की संख्या दिन-प्रतिदिन बढ़ती जा रही है और एक समस्या इस तरह की आती है कि होस्टल बहुत कम हैं, उनकी संख्या बढ़नी चाहिए। कुछ महिलाएं वर्किंग वीमेन के नाम से होस्टल ऑक्यूपाई कर लेती हैं और वे खाली नहीं होते हैं तो कोई टाईम फ्रेम होना चाहिए। 90 या 100 प्रतिशत ही कहिए, यदि हम दिल्ली का उदाहरण लें तो सौ ऐप्लिकेशन्स एक महीने में आती हैं और मुश्किल से दस-बारह को एडमीशन मिल पाता है एक साल में, तो यह हालत होती है। तो खाली करवाने की पॉलिसी क्या है? फिर खाली वर्किंग वीमेन तो नहीं होतीं, उनके साथ कई बार उनके बच्चे भी होते है। तब उनके लिए बड़ी समस्या होती है कि वे बच्चों को कहां रखें? कुछ एज-लिमिट होनी चाहिए कि अगर बच्चा इतना छोटा है तो उसके लिए केशेज प्रोवाइड करने की कोई योजना आपके पास है या नहीं? यदि नहीं है तो सरकार को ऐसी योजना बनानी चाहिए, यह मेरा सुझाव होगा। तो मैं यही पूछना चाहती हूं कि स्टेटवाइज़ वर्किंग वीमेन्स होस्टल्स की स्थापना करने की पॉलिसी क्या है? क्रैचेज के बारे में मंत्री महोदया विचार करेंगी या नहीं? और होस्टल खाली करवाने के बारे में क्या नीति अपनाएंगी? क्योंकि वर्किंग वीमेन्स होस्टल खाली नहीं होते हैं।

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: Sir, there is a time-limit for people to be allowed to stay in these hostels. The time-limit is a long one. It is five years. And as far as a scheme to evict them is concerned, I am afraid, the Central Government or the State Government really cannot take upon itself the responsibility of evicting women from the hostels. It should be done by the principal or the warden or whoever is in-charge of these hostels. I don't think the Government should arrogate to itself the responsibility of each individual's case. In any case, our responsibility is limited to the construction of the hostel, and the Central Social Welfare Board's responsibility is limited to giving salaries to a certain extent and making up the deficit, the losses that they are making. and that is it.

SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA: What about opening creches at the working women's hostels?

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: Creches have been opened. There is a figure for them. The scheme of Day Care Centres for children was launched in 1972-73. So, most of the working women's hostels, for which we give money, now have got the creches attached.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Sir, I am not asking any question but I am giving a suggestion. Firstly, I would like to request the hon. Minister to have coordination with the Women and Child Development Department and the Social Welfare Board which come under the HRD Department. I have found during my working that there is no proper coordination between the Social Welfare Board and the HRD Department. There should be some coordination so that additional funds could be obtained, grants could be obtained, and supervision could also be done. And secondly, I would like to explain that in most of the working women's hostels working women stay there, but whenever there are vacancies, the organisation is allowed to have girl-students also. If there are vacancies, that has been the position, and in my view, such cases are very rare. But there is no mode of inspection of these hostels. My suggestion can be taken up by the hon. Minister.

SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI: Sir, there is a scheme for maintenance of each hostel building for working women. When we appoint—this is not a part of the question: it seems to me and it is common sense—some responsible person as the principal or the warden of each hostel, then it is up to them to interview and fix norms for whoever can be admitted. Now somebody sitting in Delhi cannot possibly look into the application of each person coming in,

whether they are girl-students or whether they are working women; there are, probably, flaws in the scheme just as there are flaws in every scheme, but the point is who is going to monitor that. Should we send somebody from the Central Social Welfare Board down every month to check each person in each hostel?

**Cities Upgraded to Status of A-1**

*63. SHRI W. ANGOU SINGH: Will the Minister of URBAN AFFAIRS & EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) number of cities in the country upgraded to the status of the A-1 cities;

(b) the facilities extended to these A-1 cities;

(c) whether Calcutta has received the benefits of mega city plan; and

(d) the difference between the A-1 cities and mega city plan?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha.

**Statement**

(a) Four Cities in the country, namely Delhi, Mumbai, Calcutta and Chennai have been given the status of "A-1" cities.

(b) Central Government employees working in cities with "A-1" status are entitled to higher rate of House Rent Allowance, City Compensatory Allowances and Transport Allowance.

(c) Yes Sir.

(d) The Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure), with the limited purpose of grant of House Rent Allowance (HRA), City Compensatory Allowance (CCA) and Transport Allowance to the Central Government employees, classified cities with population above 50 lakhs as "A-1", on the basis of recommendation of Fifth Central Pay Commission. In the case of the Mega City Scheme, five cities *viz.* Calcutta, Mumbai, Chennai, Hyderabad and Bangalore, each having a population of more than 40 lakhs, have been selected for grant of central financial assistance for urban infrastructure development.

SHRI W. ANGOU SINGH: Sir, as regards class "A-1" cities, it has been mentioned: Delhi, Mumbai, Calcutta and Chennai, and in the case of Mega Cities, it has been mentioned: Calcutta, Mumbai, Chennai, Hyderabad and Bangalore.

May I know from the hon. Minister on what basis the selection of "A-1" cities has been made? I would like to know whether it is merely dependent on population.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I am afraid there is a slight confusion which requires to be cleared up. The Mega City Scheme is a scheme which has been inaugurated by the Ministry of Urban Affairs in the past. Now this is meant primarily for five cities where the population is four millions or more. Now there we extend some amount of financial assistance in certain fixed proportions for the building up of infrastructure projects and for executing those projects. On the other hand, what you know as "A-1" cities, they never existed before the Fifth Pay Commission Report. The Fifth Pay Commission Report indicated that two cities should become "A-1" and they were only Mumbai and Delhi. Now in the Cabinet we thought of this matter and said that this distinction, which has been historically maintained, which maintained equality between Calcutta, Chennai, Mumbai and Delhi should not be departed from and, therefore, overruling the recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission we decided that Chennai as well as Calcutta should be classed as "A-1" cities. Now the only result of A-1 status is that certain allowances which are payable to Central Government employees, which in other areas are less, are more, for example, in Calcutta the house rent allowance, the city allowance, the transport allowance are 30% as compared to 15% or less in other areas. So, all that has happened is that now, as a result of the Cabinet decision, A-1 status has been accorded to Calcutta and Chennai and there the Central Government employees will get higher emoluments by way of these perks which are appertinent to their office. On the other hand, the other is a scheme where we have recommended, as a matter of fact, that three more cities should come under that scheme. But unfortunately the budgetary constraints are such. But I must tell you this, and the House